



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Translating intentions to behavior

Citation for published version:

Vardaman, JM, Taylor, S, Allen, D, Gondo, MB & Amis, J 2015, 'Translating intentions to behavior: the interaction of network structure and behavioral intentions in understanding employee turnover', *Organization Science*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 941-1261. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2015.0982>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1287/orsc.2015.0982](https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2015.0982)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Organization Science

Publisher Rights Statement:

© 2015 INFORMS

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



Translating Intentions to Behavior: The Interaction of Network Structure and Behavioral Intentions in Understanding Employee Turnover

James M. Vardaman
Assistant Professor of Management
College of Business
Mississippi State University
Box 9581
Mississippi State, MS 39762
e-mail: jvardaman@business.msstate.edu

Shannon G. Taylor
Assistant Professor of Management
College of Business Administration
University of Central Florida
e-mail: sgtaylor@ucf.edu

David G. Allen
Distinguished Professor of Management
Distinguished Research Environment Professor
University of Memphis and Warwick Business School
e-mail: dallen@memphis.edu

Maria B. Gondo
Assistant Professor of Management
College of Business
University of Mississippi
e-mail: mgondo@bus.olemiss.edu

John M. Amis
Professor of Strategic Management & Organisation
University of Edinburgh Business School
e-mail: john.amis@ed.ac.uk

Keywords: turnover, social networks, network centrality, job embeddedness; Simmelian ties

**Translating Intentions to Behavior:
The Interaction of Network Structure and Behavioral Intentions in Understanding Employee
Turnover**

ABSTRACT

This article integrates psychological and sociological perspectives to provide a more complete explanation of the link between intended and actual turnover. Findings from two studies suggest the translation of intentions to leave one's job into turnover behavior is attenuated by centrality in organizational advice and friendship networks. Our results demonstrate that psychological and network factors jointly impact employee turnover, and distinguish the effects of different types of networks (friendship, advice), ties (in-degree, out-degree) and levels (dyadic, triadic) in the turnover process. We discuss the implications of these findings for research and practice, and propose a two-stage model of turnover grounded in temporal construal theory that describes how psychological and structural factors variously influence the turnover decision process.

Organizations have long been concerned with voluntary turnover due to its economic and non-economic costs, such as replacement costs, diminished organizational memory, and damage to employee morale (Allen, Bryant & Vardaman, 2010). To better understand employee turnover, social scientists have advanced both psychological (personality/attitudes) and sociological (network/structural) explanations. The bulk of turnover theory has grown from a psychological perspective, with process models explaining how individual and job characteristics influence key attitudes and, subsequently, turnover intentions (e.g., March & Simon, 1958; Mobley, 1977). Substantial research demonstrates that behavioral intentions are the best psychological predictors of behavior (e.g., Ajzen, 1991), and turnover theory relies heavily on intentions as the key psychological process linking job experiences with behavior (e.g., Holtom, Mitchell, Lee, & Eberly, 2008). Yet, turnover intentions explain only 15 to 20 percent of turnover variance and even the most comprehensive turnover models leave the majority of variance unexplained (Griffeth, Hom, & Gaertner, 2000).

More recent research suggests that turnover models consider not only the decision process employees go through when contemplating turnover, but also the webs of relationships in which employees are situated (Felps et al., 2009; Mossholder, Settoon, & Henagan, 2005). Such relational webs are comprised of attachments that enmesh individuals within an organization and create a sense of “stuckness” (Mitchell, Holtom, Lee, Sablinski, & Erez, 2001). For example, researchers have invoked sociological perspectives on networks and network structures to consider how factors such as embeddedness, structural equivalence, and relational position help expand knowledge of employee turnover (e.g., Feeley, 2000; Krackhardt & Porter, 1986; Mitchell et al., 2001; Mossholder et al., 2005).

Despite the advances provided by both perspectives, turnover scholars have disagreed over when prospective leavers consider the potential costs of leaving, including those associated with forfeiting social capital derived from one’s position in a social network. Mobley’s (1977) model suggests such costs are considered earlier in the process, before turnover intentions are developed, an assumption that remains prevalent in extant turnover theory (see e.g., Hom & Kinicki, 2001). Other theorists, however, presume that such costs are considered when forming quit decisions, which occurs later in the turnover process

(e.g., Rusbult & Farrell, 1983). In the present study, we draw on theories of temporal construal (Trope & Liberman, 2003) and temporal discounting (Samuelson, 1937) to explain why network centrality may be more important later (rather than earlier) in the turnover process. We suggest individuals who do not yet harbor turnover intentions, such as would be the case for those who are only thinking of quitting, will consider the social capital losses from severing network ties in more abstract terms. However, once individuals develop the intention to quit, the end of the turnover process becomes more proximal. As such, individuals become less likely to discount potential social capital losses derived from the network positions they occupy and instead see the turnover decision in more concrete terms. In this sense, the temporality of the turnover decision makes one's position in a network structure more or less salient.

This idea is particularly important in light of the fact that many individuals who report high turnover intentions do not quit. Meta-analyses also show that only 4 percent of the variance in observed intentions–turnover relationships is explained by statistical artifacts, with the relationship exhibiting wide credibility intervals, including zero (.00-.77; Griffeth et al., 2000). These findings suggest there are likely key contextual factors explaining when turnover intentions are more or less likely to translate into turnover. Whereas previous research has examined potential psychological moderators of the relationship between intended and actual turnover (e.g., personality, Allen, Weeks, & Moffitt, 2005; risk perceptions, Vardaman, Allen, Renn, & Moffitt, 2008; transformational leadership, Waldman, Carter, & Hom, 2012), we consider the interaction between network characteristics and intentions in explaining turnover behavior. In so doing, we suggest centrality's impact on turnover may be more pronounced when taken in conjunction with turnover intentions, rather than as a predictor of them.

Our theorizing is in line with recent research that differentiates general withdrawal mindsets and actual turnover (Hom, Mitchell, Lee, & Griffeth, 2012; Steel, 2002) and with work suggesting network ties may be more salient later in the turnover process (Griffeth, Steel, Allen, & Bryan, 2005). As such, it provides a conceptual point of departure that gives rise to additional network considerations. For example, the influence of dyadic ties may differ when they are further embedded in triads (Simmel, 1950; see also Krackhardt, 1998). In addition, both the type of network in which an individual is situated (i.e., advice vs.

friendship) and the psychological perspective from which structural ties are viewed (i.e., self-perceptions vs. those of others) may affect centrality's influence in the turnover process. We therefore theorize that in-degree, out-degree, and triadic (i.e., Simmelian) ties in advice and friendship networks will moderate the degree to which individuals follow through on their intentions to leave.

There are important opportunities to extend research integrating social structures into psychological process models to explain individual turnover in organizations. In testing the joint influences of turnover intentions and network centrality on voluntary turnover, we integrate psychological perspectives on employee behavior with sociological perspectives on structure. By exploring the interactive influence of network centrality on the turnover process, we further explicate how social ties foster retention—namely, by mitigating the likelihood that employees who intend to quit actually do. Although their importance has been alluded to in prior work (Felps et al., 2009; Sekiguchi, Burton, & Sablinski, 2008), the interactive effects of social ties (viz., advice and friendship centrality) have not been systematically examined in empirical turnover research. Doing so elucidates important boundary conditions that facilitate or constrain the translation of behavioral intentions into action and, moreover, addresses the debate concerning when in the turnover process social ties have the greatest impact. Further, our focus on advice and friendship network centrality yields additional insights into the turnover process when these dyadic ties are considered within relational triads. Our exploration of triadic (i.e., Simmelian) ties offers a novel perspective exploring how turnover decisions are variously affected by relationships at different levels (Mitchell, Burch, & Lee, 2014). In discussing the implications of our findings, we propose a two-stage model that delineates nuances underlying the decision process individuals go through in (1) developing turnover intentions and (2) determining whether to follow through on those intentions.

Theory and Hypotheses

Network Centrality and the Turnover Process

Extant turnover theory is driven by a series of models underpinned by the idea that most employees engage in some sort of decision process before quitting. For example, Mobley's (1977) intermediate linkages model posits that job dissatisfaction leads to thinking about quitting, which in turn

may lead to intentions to quit and, ultimately, those intentions may be translated into turnover behavior. Although turnover theory acknowledges the rare circumstances in which employees may quit without resorting to a decision process (e.g., the unfolding model's description of impulsive quits in response to a shock, or leaving according to a script; Lee & Mitchell, 1994), almost all conceptualizations propose that employees carefully consider the decision to leave. This consideration may manifest itself in terms of withdrawal cognitions (e.g., Hom & Griffeth, 1991), iterative comparisons with labor market information (e.g., Steel, 2002), or other processes. Regardless of process, though, the penultimate cognitive phenomenon preceding turnover in all of these models is turnover intentions. The translation (or non-translation) of those intentions is then theorized to be mostly a matter of the control an employee has over the decision, such as having another job in hand, sufficient financial reserves to withstand a period of unemployment, or permission from a spouse to quit without an alternative (Ajzen, 2002).

Theory and research suggest this turnover decision-making process is also influenced by one's position in a social network (Krackhardt & Porter, 1986; Mossholder et al., 2005). For example, highlighting the notion that employees are situated in various social webs, job embeddedness theory holds that such social connections will be negatively associated with leaving one's organization. Research in this tradition suggests the more centrally located an individual is within an organization's social networks, the more he or she is embedded or stuck in the organization (e.g., Lee, Mitchell, Sablinski, Burton, & Holtom, 2004). From a network perspective, this is reflected in one's degree centrality, the number of ties one has to others in the organization (Freeman, 1979). Highly central individuals are more embedded and, hence, less likely to voluntarily exit the organization because leaving involves forfeiting the associated social capital (Borgatti & Halgin, 2011).

Advice (or instrumental) networks are comprised of relationships through which individuals share information, assistance, and guidance related to the completion of work tasks. Degree centrality in instrumental networks comes in the form of advice-giving (in-degree) and advice-seeking (out-degree). As such, advice centrality reflects an organization member's involvement in exchanging insight with coworkers and engaging in mutual problem-solving. Central individuals possess (advice-giving), or have

access to (advice-seeking), stores of knowledge about work- and task-related problems and solutions (Baldwin, Bedell, & Johnson, 1997). This accumulated proficiency serves as a valuable resource for future exchanges with other organization members. Conversely, those on the periphery of the network often find it more difficult to accumulate or access social capital (Cook & Emerson, 1978).

Friendship (or expressive) networks consist of interactions that are used predominantly for social and emotional support. Friendships often involve rich interactions (e.g., gossip, storytelling) that foster open communication. Such relationships are associated with higher levels of social support because centrality in an organization's expressive network provides access to friends and opportunities to seek out others during times of instability or personal hardship (Vardaman, Amis, Dyson, Wright, & Randolph, 2012). Conversely, individuals who occupy peripheral positions in the network are isolated and may lack a strong sense of belonging (Williams, 2007). As with an advice network, centrality in a friendship network also has in-degree and out-degree forms. The former reflects the extent to which an individual is cited by coworkers as a friend, whereas the latter reflects the number of coworkers an employee cites as friends.

Although theory and research suggest network centrality negatively impacts withdrawal outcomes (e.g., Feeley, Hwang, & Barnett, 2008; Mossholder et al., 2005; Soltis, Agneessens, Sasovova, & Labianca, 2013), questions remain about where in the turnover process centrality has the most impact. We draw on temporal construal theory (Trope & Liberman, 2003) to explain why networks may play a more important role as a structural moderator of the psychological process linking intentions to behavior than as a direct predictor of intended or actual turnover.

The Moderating Role of Network Centrality: Incorporating Abstract and Concrete Construals

Temporal construal theory holds that the way individuals construe some future event depends on its temporal distance (Liberman & Trope, 1998; Trope & Liberman, 2003). Events perceived as farther away in time are construed more generally and in abstract terms, whereas events viewed as being nearer in time are construed in more concrete terms (Trope & Liberman, 2010). Accordingly, temporally distant decisions are more idealized; temporally proximal decisions are more pragmatic (Kivetz & Tyler, 2007). Given their unfolding nature, employee turnover decisions should be similarly influenced by temporal

construal, because temporal construals have implications for how individuals weigh the costs associated with leaving their jobs. Temporal construal theory suggests the forfeiture of social capital associated with leaving a central position in an organization's social networks should become more salient as the temporal distance to the quit decision decreases (i.e., in translating intentions to behavior).

From a temporal construal perspective, developing the intention to quit requires significantly less consideration of turnover costs because actual departure remains in the psychologically distant future. As intentions develop and the decision draws nearer, however, the costs associated with leaving become more salient and, hence, require deeper consideration. Thus, as turnover intentions make the decision to quit more proximal and transform turnover from an idealized decision to a pragmatic one (Trope & Liberman, 2003), central individuals who develop intentions to quit will be less likely to follow through than their peripheral counterparts because the potential loss of specific network ties and resources becomes more concrete. In this way, temporal construal theory augments embeddedness theory by explaining why advice and friendship network centrality might serve as boundary conditions influencing what happens at different points in the turnover process (see Holtom et al., 2008).

Temporal construal theory suggests an individual who views the possibility of turnover to be in the distant future will consider social capital losses in more abstract terms (e.g., "I'll have to make sacrifices"). However, turnover process models (e.g., Mobley, 1977; see also Steel & Lounsbury, 2009) indicate individuals with intentions to leave have just one step remaining: deciding whether to follow through on their intentions. This proximity moves turnover from an abstract construal of departure to one that includes specific, tangible considerations. As network ties are key contextual attributes with concrete implications, social capital losses associated with the forfeiture of one's central position in a network weigh more heavily because they loom in the near future (Martin, Gnoth, & Strong, 2009).

Relatedly, network centrality may moderate the relationship between turnover intentions and voluntary turnover because of a tendency to temporally discount losses (Samuelson, 1937). Temporal discounting refers to the tendency to undervalue the costs of future events. Substantial empirical research demonstrates temporal discounting is involved in many types of decisions (e.g., spending, investing, drug

use; Bickel et al., 2011; Estle, Green, Myerson, & Holt, 2006). Early in the turnover process, individuals are likely to discount social capital losses derived from centrality. As Steel and König (2006, p. 893) observed, “because of temporal discounting . . . what is planned today does not always turn into tomorrow’s actions.” Temporal construal theory likewise recognizes that outcomes are discounted as their temporal distance increases because individuals often fail to fully account for what will be lost by pursuing a particular course of action (Troe & Liberman, 2003). Due to this discounting, centrality in networks is likely a more powerful embedding force later in the turnover decision process (i.e., as a moderator of the turnover intentions–turnover link).

Given the embedding forces reflected in both forms of advice centrality (i.e., advice-giving and advice-seeking), surrendering access to knowledge-based resources and the associated social capital entails greater costs for highly central individuals than for those in more peripheral network positions. Central individuals in the advice-giving network, for instance, might face greater tangible sacrifices to the extent they are rewarded for their value as a key possessor or source of advice and information. Central advice-givers are perceived to have knowledge and information power within the organization (Settoon & Mossholder, 2002), which gives them greater control in the work unit and broader organization (Brown, 1978). Having dependent coworkers could also be a source of social capital. Dependent individuals tend to feel obliged to reciprocate the advice they receive with acts of goodwill, creating social capital for the advice-giver. Forfeiting such social capital would involve significant losses for a central advice-giver and thus reduce the likelihood of translating turnover intentions to behavior. Advice-seeking centrality also provides social capital, because the central individual has a larger pool of sources to draw upon for information and knowledge (Sparrowe, Liden, Wayne, & Kraimer, 2001). Because advice ties involve the exchange of resources (viz., information and expertise), feelings of felt obligation toward coworkers are more likely to develop among individuals centrally located in an advice-seeking network (Mossholder et al., 2005).

Based on these arguments, we expect both forms of advice centrality will discourage individuals from following through on their turnover intentions. Individuals located in central positions within an

organization's advice network have more to lose (e.g., knowledge, access to knowledge, task assistance, power over knowledge-dependent coworkers) and will feel greater obligation to others in the organization. Conversely, those on the periphery of advice networks have less to lose and feel fewer obligations to coworkers. Moreover, as turnover intentions shift the turnover decision from an abstract representation to a more concrete one, temporal construal theory suggests advice network ties become more important as an embedding force because they can no longer be discounted by the potential leaver (Frederick, Loewenstein, & O'Donoghue, 2002). As such, the sacrifices and trade-offs associated with organizational exit will be more salient, suggesting employees centrally located in advice-giving and advice-seeking networks will be less likely to follow through on their intentions to quit.

Hypothesis 1: (a) In-degree and (b) out-degree advice centrality will moderate the turnover intentions-turnover relationship such that the relationship will be weaker for individuals with higher centrality and stronger for those with lower centrality.

Friendship centrality may likewise influence the degree to which turnover intentions lead to actual separation, for several reasons. First, friendships allow individuals to call upon others for reassurance and encouragement, and this social support protects them from the effects of aversive work events (Cohen & Wills, 1985; Coyne & DeLongis, 1986). Second, central individuals with intentions to leave might feel greater obligation to remain in the organization in order to fulfill those friendships. Social support garnered through friendship ties conveys to individuals that they are a valued member of "a network of mutual obligation" (Cobb, 1976, p. 300). Accordingly, when care is extended by coworkers, individuals feel obliged to reciprocate with similar expressions of concern (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Given that people use concrete construals to represent information about near future events (Trope & Liberman, 2003), the value associated with friendship centrality should be influential in preventing the translation of turnover intentions because friendship ties represent specific, concrete features of the organizational context. Consistent with this view, research has found that fair and respectful interactions with others are more salient in the near (versus distant) future (Cojoharencu, Patient, & Bashshur, 2011). Temporal construal theory implies that central organization members who

develop intentions to leave may have difficulty translating those intentions into behavior because the severing of friendship ties becomes a salient, tangible consideration. Moreover, the principle of temporal discounting suggests such losses will become more germane to individuals as the temporal distance of their turnover decision decreases (Trope & Liberman, 2003). We therefore anticipate that intentions to quit are more likely to affect turnover behavior among individuals with lower friendship centrality than among those with higher friendship centrality.

Hypothesis 2: (a) In-degree and (b) out-degree friendship centrality will moderate the turnover intentions-turnover relationship such that the relationship will be weaker for individuals with higher centrality and stronger for those with lower centrality.

From Dyads to Triads: The Role of Simmelian Ties

Additional theoretical purchase can be gained by considering dyads as relationships embedded in a broader social structure. Shared third parties that form a triad are the most elemental manner of doing so. A triadic, or Simmelian, tie exists when two people are reciprocally tied to each other and they are each reciprocally tied to at least one common third party (Krackhardt, 1998, p. 24). These ties are fundamentally different from dyadic ties in character and quality (Krackhardt, 1998, 1999). Particularly relevant to the present study is Krackhardt's (1999) observation that Simmelian forces strengthen ties, suggesting that social relationships may influence the turnover process differently when they move from being dyadic to triadic in nature. Thus, it is possible that broadening focus beyond the isolated dyad will reveal further differences in the turnover process when "super strong" Simmelian ties are considered in the context of a social triad (Krackhardt, 1998, p. 24).

Simmelian ties are more than strong ties; they are especially "sticky" (Krackhardt, 1998). Simmelian tie theory holds that such ties change dyadic relationships in three important ways: they reduce individuality, bargaining power, and conflict (Simmel, 1950; see also Krackhardt, 1999). As such, these triadic forces have unique implications for the turnover process. For instance, it may be that dyadic ties associated with being central in an advice network become stronger when embedded in triads, and thus more powerfully mitigate the translation of intentions into turnover. After all, individuals with common

third-party ties in an advice network are more willing to share knowledge with each other (Reagans & McEvily, 2003). Because of the positive expectation that such cooperative efforts will be reciprocated in the future (Gouldner, 1960), organization members with Simmelian advice ties should be less likely to quit than individuals not embedded in such triads. Strong Simmelian advice ties also improve knowledge flows by enhancing shared understanding and the coordination of actions required to exploit diverse knowledge sources (Tortoriello & Krackhardt, 2010). When located within a Simmelian structure, individuals can rely on not just an individual expert, but a group of experts with whom to associate (cf. Krackhardt, 1998). Thus, when individuals are immersed in such communities of practice (i.e., closed advice triads), those who intend to quit should be less likely to do so because these instrumental advantages would be particularly difficult to sacrifice.

In an organization's friendship network, a Simmelian tie reflects three individuals who are all connected by reciprocal friendship bonds. A Simmelian structure increases the stability of relationships by reducing disagreements and encouraging thoughtful conflict resolution (Simmel, 1950; Tortoriello & Krackhardt, 2010). With an increased willingness to cooperate, members of a triad are more likely to remain in the group or organization (Jehn, 1995). Krackhardt (1998) likewise notes that members of strong triads are less free and more constrained than are members of a dyad.

From a temporal construal perspective, the severing of strong relationships with other organization members becomes more salient as individuals contemplate whether to follow through on their turnover intentions (Trope & Liberman, 2003), and individuals who have reached this point in the turnover process are less likely to temporally discount the social capital losses (e.g., social support, reciprocal cooperation) associated with these "sticky" ties. As such, individuals with more Simmelian ties should be less likely to convert their intentions into (turnover) behavior than those in fewer triadic relationships.

Hypothesis 3: (a) Simmelian advice ties and (b) Simmelian friendship ties will moderate the turnover intentions-turnover relationship such that the relationship will be weaker for individuals with more Simmelian ties and stronger for those with fewer Simmelian ties.

Overview of Studies

To test our hypotheses, we conducted two studies. In Study 1, we tested our predicted relationships with data from public school teachers. In Study 2, we sought to constructively replicate Study 1 by testing our hypotheses among nurses employed at a hospital. As such, Study 2 triangulates Study 1 results across different work contexts, and it also rules out alternative explanations that might account for results obtained in Study 1. Because we were unable to collect advice network data in Study 2, hypotheses were empirically tested only for friendship networks in the latter study.

Study 1

Sample and Procedures

The Study 1 sample consisted of 145 teachers employed in four public schools in the southeastern United States. Participants voluntarily completed a paper-and-pencil survey during work time. To ensure confidentiality, participants sealed their completed survey in an envelope and returned it directly to the first author, who spent significant time in each school. Response rates by school were as follows: School 1, 92% (22/24); School 2, 96% (46/48); School 3, 95% (36/38); and School 4, 96% (44/46). Thus, the overall response rate for the survey was 95% of the network population from the four schools ($n=148$). Approximately 2.5 years after survey completion, turnover data were collected. Because three individuals separated from the organization involuntarily, they were excluded from analysis, reducing the sample to 145. The participants included in the analysis were 65% female, and the average age was 41 years. The sample was 77% White, 18% African-American, and 5% other.

Measures

Turnover intentions. Turnover intentions were assessed on a five-point scale (1 = *Definitely No*; 5 = *Definitely Yes*) with a three-item ($\alpha = .92$) measure adapted from Hom and Griffeth (1991) that asked about an individual's intent to leave his or her job. A sample item is "I intend to quit my present job."

Network centrality. Advice and friendship networks were operationalized through answers to a close-ended sociometric questionnaire. Participants were provided with a full list of teachers in their respective schools and asked whom they considered a friend and from whom they sought advice. This

approach allowed us to gather data from the full network. From these responses, we calculated in-degree and out-degree centrality within the advice and friendship networks using UCINET software (Borgatti, Everett, & Freeman, 2002). We used Freeman's (1979) notion of relative centrality in order to control for different school sizes. Greater in-degree centrality scores indicate that more coworkers chose a particular employee as a source of advice or as a friend, while greater out-degree scores indicate the focal individual chose more coworkers as people from whom they sought advice, or as a friend.

Simmelian ties. Simmelian ties were also calculated using UCINET. A Simmelian tie exists when individual *i* and individual *j* have a symmetric tie, and both have a symmetric tie in common with at least one other individual (Dekker, 2006). The raw number of Simmelian ties was divided by the size of each network, thus providing the relative number of Simmelian ties for each individual.

Turnover. Turnover was assessed via organizational records 2.5 years after surveys were administered. Participants were coded 0 for *stayers* and 1 for *voluntary leavers*.

Control variables. Because job satisfaction is one of the best attitudinal predictors of turnover (Griffeth et al., 2000), we included it as a control variable. Participants indicated their extent of agreement (1 = *strongly disagree*; 7 = *strongly agree*) with three items ($\alpha = .70$) adopted from Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, and Klesh (1983). Previous research suggests perceived control and personality may play a role in translating intentions into behavior (e.g., Allen et al., 2005); thus, we controlled for locus of control's moderating effect by assessing it with six items adapted from Rotter (1966). We also controlled for self-reported age, gender, and tenure to account for the natural clustering of individuals with similar others in the organization. Finally, we controlled for organizational membership through the use of $k - 1$ dummy variables (1 = *member of organization*, 0 = *otherwise*).

Study 1 Results

Because Study 1 participants were nested within different schools, we calculated intraclass correlations (ICC1) to estimate the proportion of variance in scores on our measures attributable to school membership (James, 1982). Results indicated significant ICC1 values for some measures (e.g., turnover intentions, locus of control), suggesting the potential for non-independence; thus, we tested our

hypotheses with hierarchical linear modeling (HLM; Raudenbush, Bryk, Cheong, Congdon, & du Toit, 2011). The pattern of results was the same as those obtained from the regression analyses, so we report the regression results for clarity and consistency with Study 2. Given the dichotomous nature of the turnover outcome, hypotheses were tested with logistic regression. For each model, we entered control variables and main effects in step 1, followed by the multiplicative interaction terms in a second step. To demonstrate the nature of the interactions, we conducted simple slope analyses and used Dawson's (2014) technique to plot the relationship between turnover intentions and turnover at one standard deviation above and below the means of each network centrality measure.

Means, standard deviations, and correlations among Study 1 variables appear in Table 1. Twenty-four percent of study participants voluntarily quit. Hypotheses 1a and 1b predicted, respectively, that in-degree (advice-giving) and out-degree (advice-seeking) centrality in the advice network would moderate the relationship between turnover intentions and voluntary turnover. As shown in Table 2, the in-degree centrality ($\beta = -.04, p < .05$) but not the out-degree centrality ($\beta = -.03, ns$) interaction term entered in step 2 was significant. Simple slope analyses revealed that the positive relationship between intended and actual turnover was significant for individuals with low ($B = 1.39, p < .01$) but not high ($B = .33, ns$) levels of in-degree advice centrality (see Figure 1). These findings support Hypothesis 1a but not Hypothesis 1b. Relative importance analysis (LeBreton, Tonidandel, & Krasikova, 2013; Tonidandel & LeBreton, 2011) revealed that of the variance in turnover explained by the two interaction terms above and beyond the control variables and main effects, a majority (81.4%, $\epsilon = .05$) was accounted for by the in-degree interaction, whereas relatively less was explained by the out-degree interaction (18.6%, $\epsilon = .01$).

In Hypothesis 2, we predicted that in-degree (H2a) and out-degree (H2b) friendship network centrality would moderate the intentions-turnover relationship. Table 2 shows that the interaction terms entered in step 2 were significant for both forms of friendship centrality (in-degree $\beta = -.08, p < .05$; out-degree $\beta = -.11, p < .01$). As expected, the positive relationship between intended and actual turnover was significant for individuals with low ($B = 1.48, p < .01$) but not high ($B = .01, ns$) levels of in-degree

centrality, and for individuals with low ($B = 1.87, p < .01$) but not high ($B = .02, ns$) levels of out-degree centrality (see Figure 2). Moreover, relative importance analysis revealed that of the variance in turnover explained by the two interaction terms above and beyond the control variables and main effects, a majority (62.0%, $\epsilon = .09$) was accounted for by the out-degree interaction, whereas relatively less was explained by the in-degree interaction (38.0%, $\epsilon = .06$).

Hypothesis 3 stated that Simmelian advice ties (H3a) and Simmelian friendship ties (H3b) would moderate the intentions–turnover link. Results presented in Table 3 indicate that the Simmelian advice tie interaction term was non-significant ($\beta = -.03, ns$) and that Simmelian friendship ties were a significant moderator ($\beta = -.19, p < .01$). Consistent with our expectations, simple slope analysis revealed that the positive relationship between intended and actual turnover was significant for individuals with low ($B = 1.98, p < .01$) but not high ($B = -.27, ns$) levels of Simmelian friendship ties (see Figure 3). Thus, only Hypothesis 3b was supported. Relative importance analysis demonstrated that of the variance in turnover explained by the advice in-degree and Simmelian interaction terms, more (54.5%, $\epsilon = .03$) was accounted for by the former than the latter (45.5%, $\epsilon = .02$). When the interactive effects of out-degree advice centrality and Simmelian ties were compared, the Simmelian interaction (82.0%, $\epsilon = .04$) contributed more to the prediction of turnover than the out-degree interaction term (18.0%, $\epsilon = .01$). It should be noted, however, that none of the three advice ties was significantly more important than the others. In comparing friendship network effects, results showed that the Simmelian interaction term contributed more to the prediction of turnover (66.1%, $\epsilon = .09$) than did the in-degree interaction term (33.9%, $\epsilon = .05$). The Simmelian interaction term also explained relatively more variance in turnover than did the out-degree interaction term (Simmelian $\epsilon = .08, 53.2\%$; out-degree $\epsilon = .07, 46.8\%$). The Simmelian interaction was not significantly more important, however, than either of the dyadic ties' interactive effects.

Study 2

Study 1 established the moderating role of network centrality in the intentions–turnover relationship. We constructively replicate these findings in Study 2, focusing on friendship networks because of the interests and constraints of the sponsoring organization. We consider a different

occupational group (nurses) and work setting (hospitals). We also separate measurement of networks and intentions in time and consider a shorter time lag between antecedents and turnover, as there is value in replicating results across varying time lags (Allen, Hancock, Vardaman, & McKee, 2014). We also incorporate job embeddedness. Much of the research investigating the role of social interrelationships in the study of turnover relies on job embeddedness as an underlying theoretical perspective. In the present study, we suggest integrating psychological process models of turnover with theory and research on structural networks helps explain the translation of intentions into behavior. The construct of job embeddedness, however, focuses on the psychological interpretation of one's attachment to the organization—in other words, the extent to which an individual perceives him/herself as embedded in the organization. If this psychological interpretation fully accounts for the effects of network structure, there may be little need to incorporate the measurement of actual networks. Thus, there is value in establishing the role of network centrality over and above the effects of job embeddedness. Further, the operationalization of job embeddedness focuses on the number of links, with less attention paid to the content of links or the resources they offer. Part of our theorizing suggests the content of the network is an important force in influencing the translation of intentions into behavior. Thus, incorporating job embeddedness helps us to better determine whether the content (i.e., friendship ties) and perspective (in-degree, out-degree) of network centrality influence the turnover process.

Sample and Procedures

The Study 2 sample consisted of 183 nurses employed in a large metropolitan hospital in the southeastern U.S. Participants voluntarily completed two online surveys during work time. In the initial survey, we obtained social network data and demographic information. Three months later, we measured other control variables, turnover intentions, and job embeddedness. One year after the initial survey was completed, turnover data were collected. One hundred and ninety individuals responded to the initial survey. None of the participants quit before the second survey administration. Seven individuals, however, did not complete the second survey and were thus excluded from analysis. The final response

rate was 85% of the network population. The participants included in the analysis were 99% female, and their average age was 31 years. The sample was 86% White, 11% African-American, and 3% other races.

Measures

Turnover intentions. Turnover intentions were assessed with the scale used in Study 1 ($\alpha = .85$).

Network centrality. Friendship network ties were operationalized through answers to an open-ended sociometric questionnaire. Following Ibarra (1993), a network centrality index was constructed by having each participant provide the names of nurses with whom he or she is friends. Participants were allowed to list as many friends as they wished. As in Study 1, we calculated degree centrality with Freeman's (1979) measure, although because all respondents were from the same organization, the raw centrality scores were used in the analysis.

Simmelian ties. As with Study 1, Simmelian ties were calculated using UCINET. Because all participants were from the same organization, the raw number of triads was used in the Study 2 analysis.

Turnover. Turnover was assessed via organizational records one year after surveys were administered. Participants were coded 0 for *stayers* and 1 for *voluntary leavers*.

Control variables. As in Study 1, we controlled for job satisfaction ($\alpha = .83$), age, gender, and tenure. In addition, we controlled for job embeddedness with Crossley, Bennett, Jex, and Burnfield's (2007) seven-item global measure ($\alpha = .90$), both as a main effect on turnover and as a moderator of the intentions-turnover relationship. Participants responded on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = *Strongly Disagree* to 5 = *Strongly Agree*.

Study 2 Results

Means, standard deviations, and correlations among Study 2 variables are presented in Table 4. The table also shows that nine percent of participants voluntarily quit. Recall that Hypothesis 2 predicted in-degree (H2a) and out-degree (H2b) friendship network centrality would moderate the intentions–turnover relationship. Table 5 shows that the interaction terms entered in step 2 were significant for both forms of friendship centrality (in-degree $\beta = -.76, p < .05$; out-degree $\beta = -.93, p < .01$). As expected, plots of the interaction effects revealed that the positive relationship between intended and actual turnover

was significant for individuals with low ($B = 1.40, p < .02$) but not high ($B = -.73, ns$) levels of in-degree centrality, and for individuals with low ($B = 2.75, p < .01$) but not high ($B = -.81, ns$) out-degree centrality (see Figure 4), supporting Hypothesis 2. Relative importance analysis revealed that of the variance in turnover explained by the two interaction terms above and beyond the control variables and main effects, a majority (56.7%, $\epsilon = .14$) was accounted for by the in-degree interaction, whereas relatively less was explained by the out-degree interaction (43.3%, $\epsilon = .11$).

Hypothesis 3b proposed that Simmelian friendship ties would moderate the intentions-turnover link. Results presented in Table 6 indicate a significant interaction effect ($\beta = -.1.22, p < .01$). Simple slope analyses revealed that the positive relationship between intended and actual turnover was significant for individuals with low ($B = 1.69, p < .01$) but not high ($B = -.53, ns$) levels of Simmelian friendship ties (see Figure 3), supporting Hypothesis 3b. Relative importance analysis demonstrated that the Simmelian interaction contributed less (42.4%, $\epsilon = .08$) to the prediction of turnover than the in-degree interaction (57.6%, $\epsilon = .11$). The Simmelian interaction also explained less variance than the out-degree interaction (Simmelian $\epsilon = .09, 45.2\%$; out-degree $\epsilon = .11, 54.8\%$). However, the differences in relative importance between the three interactive effects were not significant.

Post hoc Analyses

While our findings give credence to our theoretical proposition that network centrality is salient later in the turnover process (i.e., in shaping how individuals *react* to turnover intentions), they say little about the role network centrality might play earlier in the turnover process (i.e., in shaping the *formation* of turnover intentions). As temporal construal theory maintains that losses associated with forfeiting social capital derived from advice and friendship ties will be discounted early in the turnover process, it suggests network centrality is less likely to be associated with turnover intentions. To examine this possibility in both studies, we regressed turnover intentions on each of the centrality variables examined in our study

hypotheses. Indeed, of the six centrality variables, only out-degree friendship centrality was significantly associated with turnover intentions.¹

General Discussion

The present study examined the role network centrality plays in the turnover process. Specifically, we tested the proposition that individuals' positions within an organization's advice and friendship networks would influence (moderate) the degree to which they translate their turnover intentions into quit behavior. As temporal construal theory suggests individuals who intend to leave are likely to view the turnover decision in more concrete terms, we predicted that the contextual forces binding centrally located individuals would make them less likely than their counterparts in peripheral network positions to act on their intentions to quit. The two empirical studies reported above lend general support to our predictions and enhance understanding of social networks and employee turnover.

Toward a Two-Stage Model of Turnover

Despite references to the possibility of interactive effects, past empirical work has not considered whether such relational forces interact with other turnover antecedents to affect actual separation. Guided by the idea that events and outcomes are discounted as their temporal distance increases (Trope & Liberman, 2003), we sought to determine whether advice and friendship network centrality might serve as boundary conditions influencing what happens at different stages in the turnover process. Our primary contribution, then, lies in integrating extant turnover process models with network perspectives on embeddedness to demonstrate that centrality in social networks stifles organizational exit by lessening the probability that individuals actually *follow through* once they develop intentions to leave.

Results across two samples put the accuracy of our temporal construal theory-based predictions in specific relief by offering a striking contrast between the turnover probabilities of individuals with high versus low centrality in various social networks. Our findings support the idea that the prospect of forfeiting social capital associated with network centrality attenuates the translation of intentions to behavior. This is noteworthy because the poor translation of turnover intentions to behavior has been

¹ Full results of the *post hoc* analyses are available from the authors.

largely thought to be due to a lack of control on the part of the decision-maker (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980). We integrated literature on decision-making and social networks to identify advice and friendship network centrality as factors that similarly inhibit the translation of turnover intentions.

Our results provide evidence that structural variables have greater impact as moderators of the intentions–turnover relationship than as antecedents of turnover intentions. Whereas network characteristics demonstrated some explanatory power as main effects in both samples, the interaction terms yielded substantial improvements in prediction. Specifically, the network variables contributed one and six percent of variance beyond the control variables and turnover intentions, and the interaction terms explained an additional 20 and 21 percent of turnover variance in Studies 1 and 2, respectively. Taken holistically, the results of our original and *post hoc* analyses suggest the decision to follow through on turnover intentions is rife with considerations beyond behavioral control. As such, our findings extend turnover theory by pointing toward a two-stage process model in which psychological factors pushing or pulling individuals out of organizations influence their turnover intentions (stage 1), and structural factors then mitigate or facilitate the translation of those intentions into turnover behavior (stage 2). This possibility is substantiated by Mitchell and Lee (2001, p. 211), who observed that the time until an individual quits

can be meaningfully separated into . . . two sequential periods that vary in their levels of internal or external control. The first period is the time between an employee's first thoughts of quitting and the subsequent decision to leave. The second period is the time between the decision to leave and actual leaving. Whereas this first period appears primarily, though not exclusively, under the individual's control, the second period appears likely affected by external forces.

Such a two-stage model offers an explanation for the inconsistent relationships found between network centrality and turnover intentions, and it serves as a platform for investigating the poor translation of intentions to behavior. To be sure, the process models that underpin much of the turnover literature correctly position turnover intentions as an intermediate linkage in the turnover process. The current research suggests, however, translating those intentions into turnover behavior is more complex than previously thought.

Differential Network Effects

Specific findings from our hypotheses offer additional insights into the effects of centrality in different types of networks. Tests of Hypothesis 1 suggest advice-giving centrality mitigates the intentions–turnover link, while advice-seeking centrality does not. Thus, while we expected both advice-giving and advice-seeking centrality to moderate the relationship between intended and actual turnover, results here suggest a network of people from whom to seek advice is not sufficient to keep those who harbor turnover intentions in the organization. In contrast, the forfeiture of power, access to resources, and other tangible benefits associated with advice-giving centrality is more powerful in preventing the translation of turnover intentions into behavior. Our findings also highlight the embedding role of friendship networks. We found that both in-degree and out-degree centrality in the friendship network moderated the relationship between turnover intentions and turnover behavior, suggesting expressive centrality acts as an embedding force in attenuating the translation of intentions to behavior.

We built on this theorizing by recognizing that Simmelian tie theory maintains dyadic relationships increase in strength when further embedded in triads. Accordingly, we expected Simmelian ties to moderate the relationship between turnover intentions and voluntary turnover. Overall, our findings regarding Simmelian ties suggest that while triadic ties exhibit similar effects on turnover as dyadic ties (particularly in friendship networks), their “super sticky” properties may not be wholly effective in retaining potential leavers (Krackhardt, 1998). Future studies of this sort would contribute to turnover theory and research by further exploring the effects of Simmelian triads as a unit of analysis distinct from the dyad and representative of larger structures (Krackhardt, 1998; Mitchell et al., 2014).

Finally, our analyses make an important contribution by considering the relative impact of global job embeddedness (Crossley et al., 2007) versus sociometric network measures. Embeddedness neither directly nor jointly (with turnover intentions) predicted turnover, and relative weights analyses showed that the interactive effect of embeddedness explained far less variance in turnover than did network centrality measures. That is, supplementary analyses testing the moderating influence of embeddedness relative to in-degree, out-degree, and Simmelian centrality revealed that the embeddedness interaction contributed substantially less to the prediction of turnover than did the interaction terms for the other

forms of centrality, though only the in-degree interaction was significantly more important than embeddedness. These results shed light on prior non-significant findings regarding on-the-job embeddedness (Lee et al., 2004). In job embeddedness research, links are typically captured by the number of people in one's work group, irrespective of the quality or content of one's relationships with specific colleagues. Our findings, however, suggest the content of work relationships may be vital for holding individuals in the organization.

Study Limitations and Future Research Directions

Despite replicating some of our findings across two different samples (education and healthcare), the generalizability of our results would be extended through additional tests of our predictions among employees in other industries, organizations, or jobs. Although the observed moderating effects offer support for their presence, the relative influences of in-degree, out-degree, and Simmelian ties remain unclear. The mixed results found in the present study suggest additional investigations in this regard could increase understanding of the roles that perspective (in-degree vs. out-degree) and level (dyad vs. triad) play when assessing the relative impact of various network ties in the turnover process.

A related issue concerns our focus on degree centrality when there are other elements of network structure that may influence withdrawal processes (e.g., closeness or betweenness centrality; structural equivalence among actors). We assessed our moderating hypotheses with betweenness and closeness instead of degree centrality, and only betweenness in the Study 1 advice network was a significant moderator of the intentions-turnover relationship. Future research that incorporates these and other elements of network structure may be of value to the turnover literature.

Our findings should also be viewed in light of two additional points. First, turnover scholars have long observed that not all turnover is dysfunctional (e.g., Dalton, Krackhardt, & Porter, 1981). A key factor in making this determination is an employee's level of performance (Abelson & Baysinger, 1984). With respect to the two-stage model of turnover proposed in the current research, central individuals may question whether their social capital will be directly transferable to another employer, or the extent to which their high performance is a result of having developed many relationships with coworkers

(Sekiguchi et al., 2008). Recent research (Bidwell, 2011) suggests that external hires receive significantly less favorable performance appraisals than internal hires who are promoted; it may be the case that high performance is context-dependent, and that network structures play an important role. In such instances, individuals who have intentions of quitting may be reluctant to leave their current employer when they occupy central positions in the organization's advice or friendship networks. Future research should examine the complex interplay among performance, networks, and turnover. Second, embeddedness research has demonstrated the impact of non-work (i.e., off-the-job or community) ties on various employee behaviors, including turnover (e.g., Lee et al., 2004). Thus, it is possible, for instance, that highly embedded individuals might be concerned with taking another job because of fears that they will be unable to replicate their level of network assistance at their future employer. This could create higher "costs" to turnover, which might be even greater when one is embedded in a number of Simmelian ties. We encourage future researchers to explore these possibilities.

Practical Implications

Our findings indicate that high degrees of connectedness decrease the likelihood that employees actually follow through on their intentions to leave. These results are important because efforts aimed at fostering forces that enhance network centrality may look quite different from those intended to increase employees' job satisfaction or organizational commitment. Because centrality reflects socioemotional attachments, focusing on pay and other tangible inducements may be overly simplistic (Rousseau, Ho, & Greenberg, 2006). Instead, our results suggest managers take steps to cultivate and improve interpersonal relations among employees to create the social attachments and felt obligation important to curbing turnover. Among the various ways that managers could foster mutually supportive relationships are mentoring programs. As Chandler, Kram, and Yip (2011) recently observed, mentoring outcomes are partly determined by the support and structure of people's developmental networks (i.e., others who take an active interest in and action to advance a focal individual's career). Findings that a person's network accounts for more variability in some outcomes than does a particular mentor (e.g., Higgins & Thomas, 2001) further underscore the importance of the structural context in studying turnover cognitions and

behavior, as developmental networks may function as a form of social capital that can reduce the likelihood of turnover (Lankau & Scandura, 2002; Payne & Huffman, 2005).

A second opportunity for managerial action centers on targeting retention efforts at specific “pressure points” within an organization’s social networks. Our results indicate this strategy is important because they suggest organizational endeavors aimed at fostering supportive workplace relationships will improve retention efforts, particularly among those employees most “at risk” of leaving (i.e., those who contemplate quitting). To do so, organizations could conduct network studies of their own to identify peripheral individuals. Once a network picture emerges, managers might then focus their efforts on enhancing these individuals’ centrality, decreasing their turnover intentions, or, if the employees are marginal performers, on recruiting their replacements. By focusing retention efforts on specific employees within various social networks, managers may reduce turnover more efficiently.

Conclusion

This study underscores Mossholder et al.’s (2005, p. 608) assertion that network centrality is “pivotal” in understanding employee turnover. The findings here showed that employees’ turnover decisions are influenced by their connections with others in advice and friendship networks. Specifically, we found that individuals located in central network positions are less likely to follow through on their intentions to quit than are individuals in more peripheral network positions. In so doing, we invoked temporal construal theory to explain why some people who develop turnover intentions quit, while most do not. Moreover, we identified important boundary conditions for the intentions-turnover relationship. We hope this study provides further impetus for future multidisciplinary research efforts into the interconnections among these behavioral phenomena.

References

- Abelson, M.A., B.D. Baysinger. 1984. Optimal and dysfunctional turnover: Toward an organizational level model. *Acad. Management Rev.* **9**(2) 331-341.
- Ajzen, I. 1991. The theory of planned behavior. *Organ. Behav. Human Decision Processes* **50**(2) 179–211.
- Ajzen, I. 2002. Perceived behavioral control, self-efficacy, locus of control, and the theory of planned behavior. *J. Appl. Soc. Psych.* **32**(4) 1-20.
- Ajzen, I., M. Fishbein. 1980. *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Allen, D.G., P.C. Bryant, J.M. Vardaman. 2010. Retaining talent: Replacing misconceptions with evidence-based strategies. *Acad. Management Perspectives*, **24**(2) 48-64.
- Allen, D.G., J. Hancock, J.M. Vardaman, D. McKee. 2014. Analytical mindsets in turnover research. *J. Organ. Behav.* **35**(1) 61-86.
- Allen, D.G., K.P. Weeks, K.R. Moffitt. 2005. Turnover intentions and voluntary turnover: The moderating roles of self-monitoring, locus of control, proactive personality and risk aversion. *J. Appl. Psych.* **90**(5) 980-990.
- Baldwin, T. T., M.D. Bedell, J.L. Johnson. 1997. The social fabric of a team-based M.B.A. program: Network effects on student satisfaction and performance. *Acad. Management J.* **40**(6) 1369-1397.
- Bickel, W.K., R.Y. Yi, R.D. Landes, P.F. Hill, C. Baxter. 2011. Remember the future: Working memory training decreases delay discounting among stimulant addicts. *Biological Psychiatry* **69**(3) 260-265.
- Bidwell, M. 2011. Paying more to get less: The effects of external hiring versus internal mobility. *Admin. Sci. Quart.* **56**(3): 369-407.
- Borgatti, S., M.G. Everett, L.C. Freeman. 2002. *UCINET for Windows: Software for Social Network Analysis*. Harvard, MA: Analytic Technologies.
- Borgatti, S. P., D.S. Halgin. 2011. On network theory. *Organ. Sci.* **22**(5) 1168-1181.
- Brown, B.B. 1978. Social and psychological correlates of help-seeking behavior among urban adults. *Amer. J. Community Psych.* **6**(5) 423-439.
- Cammann, C., M. Fichman, G.D. Jenkins, J.R. Klesh. 1983. Assessing the attitudes and perceptions of organizational members. In S. E. Seashore ed. *Assessing Organizational Change: A Guide to Methods, Measures, and Practices*. Wiley, New York, 71-119.
- Chandler, D. W., K.E. Kram, J. Yip. 2011. An ecological systems perspective on mentoring at work: A review and future prospects. *Acad. Management Annals* **5**(1) 519-570.
- Cobb, S. 1976. Social support as a moderator of life stress. *Psychosomatic Medicine* **38**(5) 300-314.

- Cohen, S., T. Wills. 1985. Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. *Psych. Bull.* **98**(2) 310-357.
- Cojuharenco, I., D. Patient, M.R. Bashshur. 2011. Seeing the “forest” or the “trees” of organizational justice. Effects of temporal perspective on employee concerns about unfair treatment at work. *Organ. Behav. Human Decision Processes* **116**(1) 17-31.
- Cook, K. S., R.M. Emerson. 1978. Power, equity and commitment in exchange networks. *Amer. Sociol. Rev.* **43**(5) 721-739.
- Coyne, J.C., A. DeLongis. 1986. Going beyond social support: The role of social relationships in adaptation. *J. Consulting Clinical Psych.* **54**(3) 454-460.
- Crossley, C. D., R.J. Bennett, S.M. Jex, J.L. Burnfield. 2007. Development of a global measure of job embeddedness and integration into a traditional model of voluntary turnover. *J. Appl. Psych.* **92**(4) 1031-1042.
- Dalton, D. R., D.M. Krackhardt, L.W. Porter. 1981. Functional turnover: An empirical assessment. *J. Appl. Psych.* **66**(6) 716-721.
- Dawson, J.F. 2014. Moderation in management research: What, why, when, and how. *J. Bus Psych.* **29**(1) 1-19.
- Dekker, D. 2006. Measures of Simmelian tie strength, Simmelian brokerage, and, the Simmelianly brokered. *J. Social Structure* **7**(1) 1-22.
- Estle, S.J., L. Green, J. Myerson, D. Holt. 2006. Differential effects of amount on temporal and probability discounting of gains and losses. *Memory & Cognition.* **34**(4) 914-928.
- Feeley, T. H. 2000. Testing a communication network model of employee turnover based on centrality. *J. Appl. Communication Res.* **28**(3) 262-277.
- Feeley, T. H., J. Hwang, G.A. Barnett. 2008. Predicting employee turnover from friendship networks. *J. Appl. Communication Res.* **36**(1) 56-73.
- Felps, W., T.R. Mitchell, D.R. Hekman, T.W. Lee, B.C. Holtom, W.S. Harman. 2009. Turnover contagion: How coworkers’ job embeddedness and job search behaviors influence quitting. *Acad. Management J.* **52**(3) 545-561.
- Frederick, S., G. Loewenstein, T. O’Donoghue. 2002. Time discounting and time preference: A critical review. *J. of Econ. Lit.* **40**(2) 351-401.
- Freeman, L.C. 1979. Centrality in social networks conceptual clarification. *Soc. Networks* **1**(3) 215-239.
- Gouldner, A. W. 1960. The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *Amer. Sociol. Rev.*, **25**(2) 161-178.
- Griffeth, R. W., P.W. Hom, S. Gaertner. 2000. A meta-analysis of antecedents and correlates of employee turnover: Update, moderator tests, and research implications for the next millennium. *J. Management* **26**(3) 463-488.

- Griffeth, R.W., R.P. Steel, D.G. Allen, N. Bryan. 2005. The development of a multidimensional measure of market cognitions: The employment opportunity index (EOI). *J. Appl. Psych.* **90**(2) 335-349.
- Higgins, M.C., D.A. Thomas. 2001. Constellations and careers: Toward understanding the effects of multiple developmental relationships. *J. Org. Behav.* **22**(3) 223-247.
- Holtom, B. C., T.R. Mitchell, T.W. Lee, M.B. Eberly. 2008. Turnover and retention research: A glance at the past, a closer review of the present, and a venture into the future. *Acad. Management Annals* **2** 231-274.
- Hom, P.W., R.W. Griffeth. 1991. Structural equations modeling a test of turnover theory: Cross sectional and longitudinal analyses. *J. Appl. Psych.* **76**(3) 350-366.
- Hom, P. W., A. J. Kinicki. 2001. Toward a greater understanding of how dissatisfaction drives employee turnover. *Acad. Management. J.* **44**(5) 975-987.
- Hom, P.W., T.R. Mitchell, T.W. Lee, R.W. Griffeth. 2012. Reviewing employee turnover: Focusing on proximal withdrawal states and an expanded criterion. *Psych. Bull.* **138**(5) 831-858.
- Ibarra, H., 1993. Network centrality, power and innovation involvement: Determinants of technical and administrative roles. *Acad. Management J.* **36**(3) 471-501.
- James, L. (1982). Aggregation bias in estimates of perceptual agreement. *J Appl. Psych.* **67** 219–229.
- Jehn, K.A. (1995). A multimethod examination of the benefits and detriments of intragroup conflict. *Admin. Sci. Quart.* **40**(2) 265-282.
- Kivetz, Y., Tyler, T.R. Tyler. 2007. Tomorrow I'll be me: The effect of time perspective on the activation of idealistic versus pragmatic selves. *Organ. Behav. Human Decision Processes* **102**(2) 193-211.
- Krackhardt, D.A. 1998. Simmelian ties: Super strong and sticky. In R. M. Kramer & M. A. Neale, eds. *Power and Influence in Organizations*. Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, 21-38.
- Krackhardt, D.A. 1999. The ties that torture: Simmelian tie analysis in organizations. *Res. Sociol. Org.* **16** 183-210.
- Krackhardt D.A., L.W. Porter. 1986. The snowball effect: Turnover embedded in communication networks. *J. of Appl. Psych.* **71**(1) 50-55.
- Lankau, M. J., T.A. Scandura. 2002. An investigation of personal learning in mentoring relationships: Content, antecedents, and consequences. *Acad. Management J.* **45**(4) 779-790.
- LeBreton, J. M., S. Tonidandel, D.V. Krasikova. 2013. Residualized relative importance analysis: A technique for the comprehensive decomposition of variance in higher order regression models. *Organ. Res. Methods.* **16**(3) 449-473.
- Lee, T.W., T.R. Mitchell. 1994. An alternative approach: The unfolding model of voluntary employee turnover. *Acad. Management Rev.* **19**(1) 51-89.

- Lee, T. W., T.R. Mitchell, C.J. Sablinski, J.P. Burton, B.C. Holtom. 2004. The effects of job embeddedness on organizational citizenship, job performance, volitional absences, and voluntary turnover. *Acad. Management J.* **47**(5) 711-722.
- Lieberman, N., Y. Trope. 1998. The role of feasibility and desirability considerations in near and distant future decisions: A test of temporal construal theory. *J. Personality Soc. Psych.* **75**(1) 5-18.
- March, J. G., H.A. Simon. 1958. *Organizations*. Wiley, New York.
- Martin, B.A., J. Gnoth, C. Strong. 2009. Temporal construal in advertising. *J. Advertising.* **38**(3) 5-19.
- Mitchell, T. R., T.C. Burch, T.W. Lee, 2014. The need to consider time, level, and trends: A turnover perspective. *J. Organ. Behav.* **35**(2) 296-300.
- Mitchell, T. R., B.C. Holtom, T.W. Lee, C.J. Sablinski, M. Erez. 2001. Why people stay: Using job embeddedness to predict voluntary turnover. *Acad. Management J.* **44**(6) 1102-1121.
- Mobley, W. H. 1977. Intermediate linkages in the relationship between job satisfaction and employee turnover. *J. Appl. Psych.* **62**(2) 237-240.
- Mossholder, K.W., R.P. Settoon, S.C. Henagan. 2005. A relational perspective on turnover: Examining structural, attitudinal, and behavioral predictors. *Acad. Management J.* **48**(4) 607-618.
- Payne, S. C., A.H. Huffman. 2005. A longitudinal examination of the influence of mentoring on organizational commitment and turnover. *Acad. Management J.* **48**(1) 158-168.
- Raudenbush, S.W., A.S. Bryk, Y.F. Cheong, R.T. Congdon, M. du Toit. 2011. *HLM 7*. Lincolnwood, IL: Scientific Software International.
- Reagans, R., B. McEvily. 2003. Network structure and knowledge transfer: The effects of cohesion and range. *Admin. Sci. Quart.* **48**(2) 240-267.
- Rhoades, L., R. Eisenberger. 2002. Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *J. Appl. Psych.* **87**(4) 698-714.
- Rotter, J.B. 1966. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychol. Monographs* **80**(1) 1-28.
- Rousseau, D.M., V.T. Ho, J. Greenberg. 2006. I-deals: Idiosyncratic terms in employment relationships. *Acad. Management Rev.* **31**(4) 977-994.
- Rusbult, C.E., D. Farrell. 1983. A longitudinal test of the investment model: The impact on job satisfaction, job commitment, and turnover of variations in rewards, costs, alternatives, and investments. *J. Appl. Psych.* **68**(3) 429-438.
- Samuelson, P. 1937. A Note on Measurement of Utility. *Rev. of Economic Studies*, **4**, 155-161.
- Sekiguchi, T., J.P. Burton, C.J. Sablinski. 2008. The role of job embeddedness on employee performance: The interactive effects with leader-member exchange and organization-based self-esteem. *Personnel Psych.* **61**(4) 761-792.

- Settoon, R.P., K.W. Mossholder. 2002. Relationship quality and relationship context as antecedents of person-and task-focused interpersonal citizenship behavior. *J. Appl. Psych.* **87**(2) 255-267
- Simmel, G. 1950. *The sociology of George Simmel*. K. H. Wolff, eds. Glencoe, IL, Free Press.
- Soltis, S.M., F. Agneessens, Z. Sasovova, G.J. Labianca. 2013. A social network perspective on turnover intentions: The role of distributive justice and social support. *Human Resource Management*. **52**(4) 561-584.
- Sparrowe, R.T., R.C. Liden, S.J. Wayne, M.L. Kraimer. 2001. Social networks and the performance of individuals and groups. *Acad. Management J.* **44**(2) 316–325.
- Steel, R.P. 2002. Turnover theory at the empirical interface: Problems of fit and function. *Acad. Management Rev.* **27**(3) 346-360.
- Steel, R.P., C.J. König. 2006. Integrating theories of motivation. *Acad. Management Rev.* **31**(4) 889-913.
- Steel, R. P., J.W. Lounsbury. 2009. Turnover process models: Review and synthesis of a conceptual literature. *Human Resource Management Rev.* **19** 271-282.
- Tonidandel, S., J.M. LeBreton. 2011. Determining the relative importance of predictors in logistic regression: An extension of relative weights analysis. *Organ. Res. Methods* **13**(4) 767-781.
- Tortoriello, M, D. Krackhardt. 2010. Activating cross-boundary knowledge: The role of Simmelian ties in the generation of knowledge. *Acad. Management J.* **53**(1) 167-181.
- Trope, Y., N. Liberman. 2003. Temporal construal. *Psych. Rev.*, **110** (3) 403-421.
- Trope, Y., N. Liberman. 2010. Construal level theory of psychological distance. *Psych. Rev.*, **117** (2) 440-463.
- Vardaman, J.M., J.M. Amis, B. Dyson, P. Wright, R.V.D.G. Randolph. 2012. Interpreting change as controllable: The role of centrality and self-efficacy. *Human Rel.* **65**(7) 835-869.
- Vardaman, J.M., D.G. Allen, R.R. Renn, K.R. Moffitt. 2008. Should I stay or should I go? The role of risk in employee turnover decisions. *Human Rel.* **61**(11) 1531-1564.
- Waldman, D.A., M.Z. Carter, P.W. Hom. 2012. A multilevel investigation of leadership and turnover behavior. *J. Management*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1177/0149206312460679.
- Williams, K.D. 2007. Ostracism. *Annual Rev. Psych.* **58** 425-452.